

But I am still just as outraged that he would get this \$38 million rebate on the backs of the middle class.

I do not know what we can do at the end to correct this. We have introduced bills. We have tried to bring it to the floor, and today I am introducing one more bill that says in the future when this process is used to slip something in that this body never considered nor knew was in there, we must be told. I think it is unbelievable these kinds of games are going on, and I think the American public expects a whole lot more from us.

I think we are here to protect them and not to line the pockets of fat cats.

CLARIFICATION OF THE MURDOCH CONTRACT

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, when such information as you have just heard is presented to the House floor, it needs to be responded to.

The fact of the matter is this: Mr. Murdoch was selling a property to the Tribune Co. headed by Quincy Jones, a black entrepreneur. Mr. Murdoch had two contracts for that property, one to be sold at this amount and one to be sold at another amount if he got a Treasury certificate.

The beneficiary of the Treasury certificate was the Quincy Jones operation, which would have received that property at less than the amount equal to the Treasury certificates. Mr. Murdoch was going to get precisely the same amount whether or not the certificates were ordered.

In the other body, the gentlewoman from Illinois argued that we should open the timeframe for the certificates to be allowed, and she amended the contract to open the timeframe to extend it.

The Senate insisted on her position. The House could not get her to remove her position, and so Quincy Jones is going to be the beneficiary of the \$38 million or \$65 million, whichever the amount is.

LEFT WANTING BY THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. KLINK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, let me get this contract correct. If I am a child and I happened to be born to a mother who is of the wrong age or who has been on assistance for too long, then the Contract With America leaves me wanting just because of the circumstances surrounding my birth. If I am a child and my mother would happen to depend on WIC, that money is now going to be block-granted, and 20 percent of it can be used for other things. The same thing for school lunch, if I am dependent upon school

lunches, we are now going to have 50 laboratories across this country where people will be able to take as much of that money out, 20 percent of it, and use it for paving highways and for doing all sorts of other things.

If I survive all of that under the Contract With America, Mr. Speaker, let me understand this, if I get to be 14 or 15 years old, and I want to learn the work ethic, I want a summer job, the Contract With America leaves me with no summer job and no opportunity to rebuild my community.

Let me understand that also, Mr. Speaker, that then if I want to go to college and get the same kind of federally backed loans that the Speaker and the majority leader had, now again, I am going to be left wanting by the Contract With America.

□ 1015

GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF MY LIFE

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ran for this office because I saw a government out of control, I see a Congress who clearly did not understand, and this morning I see additional Members of Congress who do not understand. Like the people of the 10th District of Georgia, I want a government to protect our borders and help maintain order, but otherwise I want government out of my life, out of my business and, most especially out of my pocket.

Mr. Speaker, in these first 100 days, we have made significant steps forward. We have cut Government regulation and cut taxes to return more of the fruits of labor back to workers who earn them. I can tell we are making progress because the liberal Democrats are whining loud and the bureaucrats are running scared.

There is still a long way to go. Balancing the budget will not be easy. But to the people back home, I say we can take back this great Nation of ours from the people who think that government knows best; stay involved; stay with us; we will take this country back.

FURTHER EXPLANATION TO CORRECT THE RECORD

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding.

I want to point out and correct the record again: First of all, it does not pass the straight-face test that one Senator of the minority party could force this entire House to yield to something the House never considered

or the conferees on her side. There were 17 of these deals—18 of these deals—and this is the only one that stood. I cannot believe that one Senator has ever had that kind of power.

Second, I want to point out that this \$38 million revenue does go back to the seller. The idea of this was to give the sellers benefits if they sold to minority owners. And the idea has been, we all were going to do away with those, going to do away with all of those.

We found we did away with all of them except the one, and that owner happens to be Rupert Murdoch. He gets the benefit of this.

So let us make the record perfectly clear.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

INTRODUCTION OF PROSTATE CANCER DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT ACT OF 1995

(Mr. FIELDS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Prostate Cancer Diagnosis and Treatment Act of 1995 in the hopes that we will finally do something to effectively battle prostate cancer. Prostate cancer is one of the deadliest forms of cancer for men—and yet, as men, we seem almost afraid to talk about it. More than 215,000 American men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer this year and more than 40,000 men will die from it. It is the most common form of cancer among men and the second leading cancer killer.

If you look around this Chamber—about every third male over age 50 probably already has prostate cancer in some form and does not know it; roughly one-quarter of those who are stricken, will get a life-threatening form of the disease. Most people find out about their prostate cancer too late, even though the cancer can be detected with a simple, inexpensive blood test—the P.S.A. test. This test is the most effective cancer screening marker there is; it can spot prostate cancer accurately 5 years or more before it presents a serious health problem. The American Cancer Society and several other groups recommend that everyone over age 50 get this test once a year, and General Schwarzkopf, a man who has undergone prostate surgery, said the test saved his life. Nevertheless, Medicare and veterans' health programs do not pay for this, so most of the 13 million Medicare men and a few million older veterans are not getting the care they need for early detection. My bill would fix that hole.

Finally, the budget for prostate cancer research is a pittance compared to what we are spending on other cancer research. Studies needed to identify the most effective treatment are either not being done, or will not be completed for several years. My bill would

increase the research effort by diverting more research dollars to prostate cancer.

We must end the public embarrassment about a disease that has already taken the lives of several of our colleagues and that will affect many more of us in the future. We need to make men more aware of what this disease can do and what they must do to protect themselves. I believe my bill can help point us in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

PROPOSED CUTS TO STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

(Mr. BALDACCI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the cuts to student financial aid that have been proposed by our Republican colleagues. It would seem that I am not alone in my concerns.

I have received letters from hundreds of Maine college students and their families. Each letter tells a poignant story of what Federal financial aid means to that family.

One student wrote to tell me that he was the first person in his family to go to college. His parents work hard, but the family still struggles to make ends meet. He dreams of finishing his bachelor's degree, perhaps going on to obtain further education, and then securing a well-paying job so that he can support himself and help his parents out.

But without Federal financial aid, he will not be able to even finish his undergraduate studies.

In our zeal to provide tax cuts for the well-off, we must not forget about those who will come next. We must continue to ensure that bright, motivated, hard-working young Americans have the opportunity to better themselves through higher education. We must continue to invest in the future of our Nation by continuing to provide student financial aid.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF BIGGER GOVERNMENT

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for the last generation the governing principle here in Washington, especially here in the Congress, was always, above all, make government bigger. We now see the consequences of this ridiculous principle, almost \$5 trillion national debt, bloated, inefficient government, failed welfare state, obsessive regulation, and some of the highest taxes in history.

Mr. Speaker, the liberal Democrat leadership claims that we Republicans

misread the message of last November. They claim Americans really do not want a tax cut, they do not want term limits, they really do not want to balance the budget. But, Mr. Speaker, it is the liberal Democrats who have misread the message of last November, because, you see, the Contract With America is not about Republicans, it is about the American people. The American people want an end to the out-of-control growth of a Federal Government, they want safer neighborhoods, they want lower taxes, they want a secure future for their children. That is what our contract is all about.

It is not really all that complicated. The new governing principle in this Nation is not what benefits the Government but what benefits the American people.

THE DEFICIT EXPLOSION ACT

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on the path to approve the Deficit Explosion Act last night, otherwise known as the campaign tax cut bill, the Gingrichites hit a roadblock. How they dealt with that roadblock was significant implications for the future of this Congress and this country.

You will recall that on day one a rule was approved here requiring a three-fifths' vote for a tax hike. In all the talk of capital gains tax reduction yesterday, overlooked was the fact that the capital gains taxes were actually raised from 14 percent to 19 percent for many small companies in this country.

How was that dealt with when it came time to apply the three-fifths' vote requirement? It was dodged, it was hedged. Instead they turned to the captive consultants of the Joint Tax Committee, who told us that we did not need a three-fifths vote because the basis for this conclusion relates generally to the fact that this provision would be inoperative as it relates to current law after the enactment of the pending legislation.

Meaningless gobbledygook. If you strike a provision in one place and add another, it is not a tax increase? Well, taxpayer protection bit the dust last night.

CONTRACT WITH AMERICA: WE KEPT OUR PROMISE

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, it is simple; our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third;

and cut the congressional budget. We kept our promise.

It continues that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; Government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence—we kept our promise; congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature—we kept our promise.

And finally, the Contract With America Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act, including tax cuts for middle-income families, and the Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty—we kept our promise.

This is the Contract With America.

WE SHOULD NOT IGNORE OUR OWN RULES

(Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was very disappointed that we undermined our own rules and procedures to assure the passage of the tax bill. As my colleagues know, and as it was explained just now by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] there was a substantial increase. In 20 years in the State legislature and in Congress, I have never voted against the ruling of the Chair. In fact earlier this year I supported Speaker GINGRICH in the resolution on Mexico against my own colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR]. But in this instance I was forced to vote against the Chair.

While I sincerely compliment the gentleman from California who chaired during this and was very fair-minded throughout, I do fault those Members who advised him from the floor to totally ignore our rules which were only 3 months ago adopted.

Our rules are the glue that hold this body together under the best and most adverse conditions. If we ignore them intentionally, we not only act with intellectual dishonesty but we invite anarchy.

ITEMS CONTAINED IN THE MINORITY LEADER'S MOTION TO RE-COMMIT

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, last night when the minority leader presented his